

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

SVB FINANCIAL GROUP,

Plaintiff,

v.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE
CORPORATION, AS RECEIVER FOR
SILICON VALLEY BANK, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [24-cv-01321-BLF](#)

**ORDER DETERMINING CASES ARE
NOT RELATED**

[Re: ECF 136]

Currently pending before the Court is an Administrative Motion by Defendant Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, As Receiver for Silicon Valley Bank (“FDIC-R”) to consider whether cases should be related pursuant to Civil Local Rules 3-12 and 7-11, namely *SVB Financial Group v. Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as Receiver for Silicon Valley Bank and Silicon Valley Bridge Bank, N.A.*, No. 5:24-cv-0132-BLF (“*SVBFG*”); and (2) *Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as Receiver for Silicon Valley Bank v. Becker et al.*, No. 5:25-cv-00569-NC (“*Becker*”). ECF 136. Plaintiff SVBFG (“Plaintiff”) has filed an opposition. ECF 139.

Under Civil Local Rule 3-12, an action is related to another where: (1) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction, or event; and (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges. Civ. L.R. 3-12(a). After reviewing the parties’ papers and the relevant record, this Court finds that the *SVBGF* and *Becker* actions are NOT related within the meaning of Civil Local Rule 3-12, as the two actions do not “concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction, or event.” Civ. L.R. 3-12(a)(1). Therefore, the Court DENIES FDIC-R’s Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 22, 2025


BETH LABSON FREEMAN
United States District Judge

United States District Court
Northern District of California